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The “ancient novel” is a diffuse phenomenon, comprising a core of clearly fictional texts generally acknowledged (by classicists, at least) as meeting the criteria for designation as “novels,” and a ‘fringe’ of prose texts that flirt with fictionality to varying degrees. If, for the purposes of this brief discussion, we restrict our gaze to the seven extant texts typically assigned to the core—the five Greek romances (Chariton’s *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Xenophon’s *Ephesiaca*, Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*, Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica*) and the two “comic” novels in Latin (Petronius’ *Satyricon*, Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*)—we will find that, in spite of certain promising convergences, it is not easy to identify direct connections between the Epic Cycle and this corpus. Obvious references to the content of the Cycle are relatively infrequent, while arguably the most prominent display of Cyclic themes in the novels, the *Sack of Troy* recited by Petronius’ Eumolpus, is, first and foremost, a parodic reworking of Roman texts (Vergil and Seneca), and only residually (if at all) an evocation of Greek models. The difficulty, to be sure, is compounded by the very fragmentary state of our evidence for the Cycle itself, which makes it virtually impossible to say whether any given reference to the stories reported in the Cycle is intended as an allusion to a specific Cyclic text, or instead draws merely on general knowledge of heroic legend. All the same, the Cycle makes a disappointing showing in the extant novels—especially considering the many good reasons for supposing that traces of its influence might be there to be found.

There is, first of all, the suggestive chronological proximity of literary trends. The mid- to late-1st century CE is a period that sees not only the birth of the Greek romance (so far as we can tell), but also a renewed interest in the penumbra of Trojan legends surrounding the Homeric poems. Much uncertainty surrounds the dating of the novels, but there is now broad consensus that *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, the earliest of the extant Greek texts, should be placed roughly around 50 CE, and there is a strong likelihood that the earliest fragmentary romances (the so-called *Ninus* and *Metiochus and Parthenope*) were composed in the decades immediately thereafter. Meanwhile, Petronius’ *Sack of Troy* is only one indicator of a noticeably more intense engagement in the same period with the more obscure details of Trojan legend. Others include the *Trojan Oration* of Dio of Prusa, the Trojan war trivially collected in Ptolemaeus Chennos’ *New* (or *Novel*) *History*, Statius’ *Achilleid*, and possibly Lucan’s *Iliaca* (of which only two certain fragments remain). This interest is sustained into the second and third centuries, when it develops a distinctly novelistic cast: witness the Greek texts translated into Latin as the *Diary of the Trojan War*, pseudepigraphically attributed to a certain Dictys of Crete, and the *History of the Fall of Troy* supposedly by the Trojan priest Dares, as well as Philostratus’ *On Heroes*. Works such as these speak to the fundamental amenability of Trojan (and thus Cyclic) themes to treatment according to the narrative predilections of imperial prose fiction. There is no obvious reason to discount the possibility that first-century experimenters with the form would not likewise have perceived the potential inherent in the Cycle.

Indeed, the extant novels—especially the five Greek romances—are far from reluctant to exploit epic models. All of them engage, sometimes directly, sometimes
indirectly, with the Greek epic tradition. Chariton’s Chaereas and Callirhoe illustrates the range of possibilities in this regard. After the marriage of the protagonists, the story’s complicating action is set in motion by the plotting of Callirhoe’s frustrated suitors, who are angered by the fact that Chaereas has succeeded where they have failed. The malicious suitors, their conspiratorial meeting to hatch a fatal scheme (1.2), even the contemptuous terms in which they characterize their rival, whom they describe as a penēs “beggar” (1.2.3), all plainly evoke the Odyssey. At the same time, the destabilizing force they represent, the force that sets the plot in motion, is equated by explicit allusion with the event that sets in motion the entire Trojan saga: ‘Such was the wedding of Thetis on Pelion, according to the poets’ hymns; but on this occasion, too, a certain envious power was present, as they say Strife was then’ (1.1.16). This might be counted as a rare example of allusion to one of the poems of the Cycle (the Kypria); more likely it is simply a reference to the more amorphous body of Trojan legend. There can be no doubt, however, about Chariton’s many quotations from the Homeric poems, taken in roughly equal measure from the Iliad and the Odyssey.8

The whole of the epic tradition thus lies within the novel’s reach. Without a doubt, Chariton is especially eager to situate his text in relation to epic models: the range and frequency of his epic references are exceptional. Nevertheless, all of the extant Greek erotic novels can be seen to engage more or less substantially with the master text for the romance of return, the Odyssey: ‘To greater or lesser degree, and with varying degrees of specificity, all the novels are descants on the second Homeric epic.’9 The Odyssey is a principal intertext for the novels of Petronius and Apuleius as well. Encolpius’ wanderings and apparent persecution by Priapus, for instance, are commonly understood as comic transformations of the suffering imposed on Odysseus by a wrathful Poseidon, while the central scene of the Metamorphoses—the episode in the robbers’ cave, which frames the Cupid and Psyche novella—simultaneously evokes both Odysseus’ encounter with the Cyclops and his vanquishing of the suitors on Ithaca.10 The prominence of the Odyssey as a point of reference can be explained by the fact that it provides such a rich matrix of novelistic preoccupations and techniques. The narrative of return outlines a basic trajectory and a closural paradigm that are as relevant to Lucius’ struggle to recover his human form as they are to the more literal homecomings of the Greek romances; Odysseus’ dalliances and his longing for Penelope establish the utility of eros as a motive force for both ‘centripetal’ and ‘centrifugal’ modes of narrativity11; the episodic structure, particularly of Odysseus’ apologoi, offers a model for the composition of an extended, self-renewing plot; the insertion of Odysseus’ first-person perspective in a third-person frame exposes the contrasting possibilities represented by homodiegetic, heterodiegetic, and embedded narrators; and, finally, the contrast between the plausibility of Odysseus’ ‘Cretan lies’ and the fantastic quality of his apparently truthful tales in Alcinous’ palace signals an interest in exploring the very nature of fictionality.12

The Odyssey’s preeminent position as a point of reference for the novelists is, therefore, guaranteed by its particular combination of formal and thematic properties. But many of the poems of the Cycle would appear to have equal claims in these regards. Aristotle famously contrasts the Cypria and the Little Iliad with the Iliad and Odyssey precisely on the basis of the episodic character of the former (Poetics 1459a30-b7).13 So, for instance, the compositional structure of Xenophon’s Ephesiaca, with its lengthy concatenation of discrete episodes exhibiting minimal causal links, bears a stronger
resemblance to the *Cypria*, so far as we can tell, than to the *Odyssey*—although the *Odyssey* itself is more “Cyclic” in this regard than the *Iliad*. With respect to themes, Rohde already identified the Cycle as a potential source for the kinds of erotic narratives that would later exert an influence on the novel (in his view, through the intermediary of Hellenistic poetry). These seem to have been especially prominent in the *Cypria*, a poem that may have derived its name from the prominent role played by Aphrodite in the direction of the action: in addition to the love affair of Helen and Paris—a story that may lie somewhere in the background of Xenophon’s tale of Aigialeus, whose love affair with Thelxinoe resulted in their precipitous flight from Sparta (*Eph. 5.1.4-11*)—that poem also included a series of inset erotic tales narrated by Nestor (*Cyp. Arg. 27-29* Bernabé) and several romantic episodes featuring Achilles (the affair with Deidameia, the ruse of marriage with Iphigenia, and the encounter with Helen, engineered in part by Aphrodite). Erotic motifs can also be traced in the *Aithiopis*, possibly in the *Iliou Persis*, and in the *Telegony*, which recounted Odysseus’ marriage with the Thesprotian princess Kallidike and brought the Trojan cycle as a whole to a conclusion with a convenient set of marriages. This happy ending through marriage even prompted Albert Severyns to declare that the *Telegony* ’marks the end of the epic genre, and announces a new genre, that of the prose romance’. Another staple of the novel, travel in foreign lands, was presumably much in evidence in the *Nostoi*, which featured, in the course of recounting the journeys of numerous heroes, an account of the time spent in Egypt by the reunited lovers Helen and Menelaus. Egypt, of course, is the novelistic setting *par excellence*. This rich store of material, as noted above, has left few verifiable traces in the novelistic corpus. But the *Nostoi* and especially the *Telegony*, by virtue of their position as collateral narratives that circulated beside and contextualized the master-romance of the *Odyssey*, point to a form of indirect influence that the Cycle may have exerted on at least some novels.

One of the most distinctive features of the core group of ancient novels, which differentiates them from the bulk of ancient literature, is their avoidance of any direct reliance on external frames of reference—historical facts or literary traditions—to provide contextual support for their narratives. (Chariton—exceptionally, but perhaps not insignificantly, as we shall see—does construct certain links between his narrative and the history of Syracuse.) This autonomy vis-à-vis other narratives is in fact constitutive of fiction (and ancient fiction) as such. The difference from the *Odyssey* could not be more extreme: that text binds itself particularly closely to the contextualizing narrative represented by the Cycle. The tales of Nestor and Menelaos in Books 3 and 4 introduce embedded versions of the *Nostoi*, implying that the story of Odysseus’ return is only the latest episode in a sequential narrative that begins well outside the limits of the poem. And Teiresias’ prophecy, recapitulated by Odysseus in Book 23 (248-84), emphasizes that Odysseus’ story will not conclude with the end of the poem, but will extend beyond—into the events narrated in the *Telegony*. The *Odyssey*, then—perhaps even more than the *Iliad*, which has its own set of internal connections to the surrounding Cyclic narratives—draws attention to its position within a larger narrative continuum, in a way that would seem precluded by the fundamental autonomy of the novels.

Two of the Greek romancers, however, strive deliberately to create the impression that the stories of their fictional protagonists escape the limits of their texts. It is tempting
to think that they do so in part because their archetype, the *Odyssey*, suggested to them the desirability of introducing a “centrifugal” counterpoint to their “centripetal” acts of closure, and that they look to the *Telegony*, Severyns’ ‘romance’ in verse, as a means of conjuring an extension of a story world that is, by its nature, strictly bounded by a single narrative.

The problems presented by the conclusion of Achilles Tatius’ novel are well-known.24 At the beginning of the text, the anonymous narrator encounters in Sidon a solitary Cleitophon, whose narrative of his adventures constitutes the rest of the novel; but Cleitophon concludes his story by telling only of his return with Leucippe to Tyre, and their intention to travel to Byzantium in the spring. The unclosed frame leaves open the question of what Cleitophon is doing (by himself?) in Sidon. Is it too much to see in this man who has ‘suffered so much on account of love’ (τοσαύτας ὠβρεῖς ἐξ ἔρωτος πιθών, 1.2.1) and is now wandering apart from his beloved—a man, moreover, who will soon distinguish himself as an artful (and unreliable) narrator of his sufferings—an image of the Odysseus of the *Telegony*?

More suggestive still is the sequel predicted in Chariton’s romance. At the novel’s end, Callirhoe has returned to Syracuse with her first husband Chaereas, but she has left their son (whom Chaereas has never seen) in Miletus, in the care of her second husband Dionysius, who believes the child to be his own. Callirhoe, who compares herself to Odysseus early on (2.5.11), shares with her predecessor a multiplicity of conjugal ties, and she scripts for her unconventional family an eventual reunion that recalls the one that brings together Odysseus’ nearest and dearest in the last poem of the Cycle. Callirhoe directs Dionysius to send her son to Syracuse after marrying him to his own daughter, so that he may be reunited with his maternal grandfather—and of course with his father, although she cannot mention this to Dionysius (8.4.6). This reunion is presumably to be happier than the one reported in the *Telegony*, in which Telegonus mistakenly killed his father, but it is similarly accompanied by the fusion, through marriage, of the distinct branches of the family.

Perhaps, however, the darker undertones of this Cyclic intertext ought not to be so quickly discounted in the complex interplay Chariton sets up between his fiction, its literary models, and history. Several scholars have suggested that Callirhoe’s child, left in the care of Dionysius (whose name he might reasonably inherit)—a strange and apparently unnecessary anti-closural detail—is meant to be the tyrant Dionysius I, who succeeded Hermocrates (Callirhoe’s father in Chariton’s fictional world) as ruler of Syracuse.25 This historical Dionysius in fact married a daughter of Hermocrates, who suffered greatly as a result of the union—according to Plutarch, eventually taking her own life (*Dio* 3). Chariton has clearly tried to connect his tale with Syracusan history, but here a seemingly irremediable discrepancy arises—is Callirhoe to be understood as the mother or as the wife of Dionysius I? Or somehow as both? The discrepancy is, if not resolved, at least reduced on a “Telegonic” reading of Chariton’s blend of fiction and history, for the *Telegony* authorizes both roles: in a composite view that blends all the literary and historical sources, Callirhoe may be understood as a Penelope figure (the woman who marries the returning child) or / and as an Odysseus figure (the parent who suffers on account of the child). The last of the Trojan epics charts a possible interchange between the worlds of fiction and history; and the Epic Cycle, as a narrative that both
inhabits and escapes the Homeric master-text, provides a vehicle by which the novel may transcend the limits of its own fiction.
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